



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

#### IV.—NOTES ON THE PSEUDO-VERGILIAN CIRIS.

##### V. 5.

Etsi me vario iactatum laudis amore  
 irritaque expertum fallacis praemia volgi  
 Cecropius suavis expirans hortulus auras  
 florentis viridi sophiae complectitur umbra,  
 iamque mea ratione indignumst quaerere carmen, 5  
 longe aliud studium atque alios quae accincta labores  
 altius ad magni subtendit sidera mundi  
 et placitum paucis ausa est ascendere collem :  
 non tamen absistam coeptum detexere munus,  
 in quo iure meas utinam requiescere musas 10  
 et leviter blandum liceat deponere morem.<sup>1</sup>

5 *Tum mea queret eo dignum sibi Ha*    *Tum ea queret eo dignum sibi R*  
*Tu mea queret eo dignum sibi Le*    6 *alque om. Le quae om. HRa q; L que e*  
 7 *subtendit Scaliger suspendit HRa*    *suspensi Le suspexit Schrader.*

Vv. 5f. seem hopelessly corrupt, and no conjecture, however heroic, has yet remedied the evil. Many attempts have been made to improve the lines, but they are all open to more or less serious objection. Ribbeck's reading is, on the whole, the most satisfactory, as far as the meaning of the passage is concerned ; but it is not very close to the manuscripts, and necessitates the insertion of *quae* in v. 6 with the unpleasant elision.

Now if we read vv. 1-11, omitting v. 5 for the moment, we see that vv. 1-8 are devoted to a description of the author's present pursuits: v. 5, therefore, should not disturb, but rather assist, this description. *Aliud* in v. 6 suggests that something has just been mentioned with which the present plan of life is contrasted. *Accincta* and *suspexit* show that a subject is wanting in the nominative feminine singular. With these thoughts in mind, I propose the following reading :

et mea quae ratio dignata est quaerere carmen,  
 longe aliud studium atque alios accincta labores,  
 altius ad magni suspexit sidera mundi.

If this is assumed as the true reading, the corruption is explained as follows. Some reader in ancient times, feeling that the contrast between the author's old habits and the new was not evident, wrote *tum* in the margin as being understood in v. 5.

<sup>1</sup>Quotations are made from Ribbeck's text and apparatus unless otherwise specified.

Later this *tum* easily usurped the first place in the line. Then the *quaerat* which lay concealed in *quae ratio* was brought forward as the principal verb of the line, and was changed to the future because the subjunctive had no meaning. With one verb in the line already there was no further need of *dignata est*, indeed it was incomprehensible with *ratio* lost, and soon became *dignum sibi*. Thus the present manuscript reading was reached. The first impulse to this course of corruption is to be found in the gloss *tum*, and in the unusual arrangement of the words *mea quae ratio* (for *mea ratio quae*). That this arrangement is awkward is readily confessed, but it is not surprising in the work of so slender a genius as the poet of the Ciris. The reading suggested has this further advantage: the words *dignata est quaerere carmen* refer to the beginning of the composition of this very poem, the Ciris, and thus prepare the way for the otherwise unexpected *coeptum munus* in v. 9.

For *dignari* in this sense, compare Catullus 64, 407 *quare nec talis dignantur visere coetus | nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro*; Lucr. V 51 *nonne decebit | hunc hominem numero divum dignarier esse*; better still Hor. Epist. II 2, 86 *hic ego rerum | fluctibus in mediis et tempestatibus urbis | verba lyrae motura sonum conectere digner*; and Virg. Ecl. VI 1 *Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu | nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalia*. For *quaerere* thus used with *carmen*, no parallel is found; but the word is not out of place here, if we consider the nature of the mythological investigations which were involved in the composition of a poem like the Ciris. And, furthermore, it may be said that the author is rather given to the arbitrary use of words in unusual meanings. *Ratio* in this passage means 'intellectual power,'—a substitute for genius either in the Alexandrian mythological poet or in the philosopher who sets forth his system in verse. *Carmen* must be understood to refer, not to 'poetry' in general (which would require *carmina*), but to this particular poem, the Ciris.

## V. 58.

complures illam et magni, Messalla, poetae (nam verum fateamur: amat Polyhymnia verum)	55
longe alia perhibent mutatam membra figura Scyllaeum monstro saxum infestare voraci; illam esse aerumnis quam saepe legamus Ulixi candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris Dulichias vexasse rates et gurgite in alto	60
depressos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis.	

Mr. Robinson Ellis (A. J. P. VIII, p. 401) says that "no explanation which can be thought adequate has yet been given of the construction of *aerumnis*." Forbiger takes *aerumnis* in the sense of *narrationes de aerumnis Ulyssis*, on the analogy of the Greek use of *νόστοι*, and makes *Ulixi* a genitive. This explanation, it must be admitted, is inadequate, and too fanciful for acceptance without further support. But, as one reads through these lines for the first time, *aerumnis* can hardly fail to range itself as an ablative with *vexasse* in v. 60, and on second thought there appears to be no reason for rejecting this natural arrangement. The distance between the two words will be urged as an argument against this construction. But it must be remembered that vv. 59 and 60 are taken bodily from Virgil (Ecl. VI 75f.), and therefore if the poet was to use *aerumnis* at all, it must be introduced at some distance from its verb. Many instances of worse patching than this might be quoted from the *Ciris*.

vv. 62 ff.

After this passage come the following puzzling lines :

sed neque Maeoniae patiuntur credere chartae  
nec malus istorum dubiis erroribus auctor.  
namque alias alii volgo finxere puellas,  
quae Colophoniaci Scyllae dicantur Homero.

65

Sillig paraphrased v. 63 thus: "*nec hoc credere patitur, qui dubiis erroribus (per mare) istorum (Ulixis eiusque sociorum) malus (i. e. perniciosus, noxius) auctor fuit, i. e. Neptunus, qui ipse huius Scyllae pater fuit, quam propterea pro illa Nisi filia habere non possumus.*" Forbiger follows Pütz,<sup>1</sup> paraphrasing thus: "*nec tamen Homerus malus auctor est illarum narrationum de erroribus Ulyssis eiusque sociorum.*"

Sillig's theory will certainly not hold, and Pütz's interpretation is far from clear. Does he mean that Homer is not the author of the wanderings of Ulysses, or that he is a *good* author, not a *bad* one? Neither supposition seems reasonable.

The lines are best taken as a direct attack on the authority of Homer; and by Homer the author means not only the poet of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but also the writer of all the epic poetry which went under his name in antiquity. The passage

<sup>1</sup> Pütz, Wilh., *Adnotationes ad Virgili Cirim*, Coloniae 1846. Unfortunately this paper was not accessible to the writer of the present article.

should be construed as follows. The phrase *Maenoniae chartae* refers to Homeric poetry, as usual. *Credere* is used practically as a noun in the accusative case, the object of *patiuntur*. *Malus auctor* is Homer. *Istorum*, modifying *auctor*, refers to *complures poetae* of v. 54. *Dubiis erroribus*, ablative of specification with *malus*, refers to the mythological mistakes and contradictions in Homeric poetry. As predicate of *auctor*, *patitur credere* is to be supplied. 'As for these tales, however, we cannot put any confidence in Homeric poetry in general, nor in Homer himself, the unreliable authority for the poets mentioned above, with all his error and uncertainty. For there are many mythological characters, drawn from one source or another, which have been put forth by Homer under the name of Scylla.'

The vulnerable point in this interpretation is in the words *istorum dubiis erroribus*. But two circumstances may be mentioned which will lend some weight to the theory, and possibly anticipate some objection. First, *istorum* is to be referred to *poetae* (v. 54) rather than to Ulysses and his comrades, because of the argumentative use of this pronoun; *illorum* would be the word naturally used to refer to Ulysses and his comrades. Second, *erroribus* is better taken in the figurative sense of 'mistakes,' rather than in the literal sense of 'wanderings,' because the whole passage is devoted to the refutation of mistaken myths, and because the interest is not in the wanderings of Ulysses, but in his one adventure with Scylla.

## V. 279.

nam nisi te nobis malus, o malus, optima Carme,  
ante hunc conspectum casusve deusve tulisset,  
aut ferro hoc' (aperit ferrum quod veste latebat)  
'purpureum patris dempsissem vertice crinem  
aut mihi praesenti peperissem vulnere letum.'

280

279 *hunc* | *huic* H.

The phrase *ante hunc conspectum* has been variously explained. Heyne thought it might mean 'before my eyes' (*hunc* = *meum*); Sillig took *conspectum* as a participle and *hunc* as referring to Nisus, 'before he [with a gesture] was seen.' Scaliger suggested a change to *ante expectatum*; Drakenborch (on Silius Italicus II 31), *ante in conspectum*; Baehrens (Jahrb. 105, p. 845), *hunc in conspectum* (but in his text he prints *ante in*). None of these interpretations or emendations are satisfactory: Heyne's is bad, because, even if we admit that the Latin may bear the meaning which he finds in it, still it was not the *sight* of Carme that

stopped Scylla,—recall v. 223 *corripit extemplo fessam languore puellam*; Sillig's is bad, because, again, it was not the *sight* of her *father* which was the decisive point of the affair in hand; Scaliger's is bad, because it presupposes that Carme was expected to appear at *some* time, but not till later; Drakenborch's is open to the same objection as Heyne's, though the Latinity is better. The trouble seems to lie in *conspectum*: the idea that Scylla sees Carme, or that Scylla sees her father, or that Carme sees Scylla, has nothing to do with the story. Arguing, then, that the word *conspectum* introduces an idea foreign to the passage, and with the hope of procuring an addition to the thought which is far more appropriate to the passage, I should suggest that *ante hoc confectum* be read in place of *ante hunc conspectum*, 'before the completion of the matter in hand.' The corruption of this phrase would not have been impossible: if *confectum* were once mistaken for *conspectum*, the scribe would naturally change *hoc* to *hunc* in order to make it agree with the noun *conspectum*.

## V. 344.

paulatim tremebunda genis obducere vestem  
 virginis et placidam tenebris captare quietem  
 inverso bibulum restinguens lumen olivo  
 incipit ad crebrosque insani pectoris ictus  
 ferre manum, assiduis mulcens praecordia palmis.

345

345 que Bothius, om. HLRea.

The whole of v. 344 is almost certainly to be regarded as an interpolation, which was originally written as a gloss on *tenebris*, and which later crept into the text. Some reader may have failed to understand that Carme shaded Scylla's eyes by drawing the fold of her garment over them, and therefore have felt the need of something to explain *tenebris*. The objections to the line are: (1) that no mention has been made of any lamp, and it is unreasonable to suppose that either of the women should have a lamp, for Scylla would certainly trust to her familiarity with the rooms and passages when she was engaged in so secret an enterprise, and Carme had sprung from her bed in too much excitement to stop for a light; (2) that the line is an awkward obstacle between the infinitives *obducere*, *captare* and the verb on which they depend, *incipit* in v. 345; (3) that the participle *inverso*, which, as Heyne remarked, must be from *invergere* and not from *invertere*, is not found elsewhere, and is therefore more likely to have been written by a scribe of the Middle Ages than by the author of the poem.

## VV. 359 ff.

Lines 358 ff. read as follows (the exact reading of H is given for 360, 361):

nunc tremere instantis belli certamina dicit  
communemque timere deum, nunc regis amicis,  
namq. ipsi veritas est orbum fit maesta parente; 360  
cum Iove communes qui habuere nepotes

The other MSS show the following variations: iþo L $\epsilon$  verita est L $\epsilon$ a orbari L $\epsilon$  flet R $\epsilon$ a paretê R parentem a parente L $\epsilon$  quin R q quodâ L qui quondam  $\epsilon$ a.

This manuscript tangle has never been satisfactorily straightened out. The old vulgate before Heyne ran thus:

namque ipso verita est orbari maesta parente  
cum Iove communes qui quondam habuere nepotes.

Heyne considered the two lines an interpolation.

Sillig wrote:

nunc ipsi verita est, orbum flet maesta parentem

and bracketed the next line. "Primum enim de patris amicis," he says, "tum de ipso, deinde de se adeo est sollicita," sc. Scylla. This dodges the difficulty by bracketing 361; and the latter part of 360 is only with difficulty made to mean, "she mourns for her father's possible bereavement in case she herself should be killed."

Haupt (Opusc. III, p. 86 f.) brands Heyne's decision as "nicht Kritik, sondern Rathlosigkeit," and suggests the following reading:

iamque ipsi verita est, orbum flet maesta parentem  
cum Iove communes quem par sit habere nepotes.

He believes that the words have a touch of tragic irony in them: to her listeners her words would mean only that her father deserved to be placed on an equality with Jupiter; in her own mind she was thinking of Minos, who, it will be remembered, was the son of Jupiter. In objection to this reading should be noted the asyndeton in 360, and the violence of the change in *quem par sit* from anything offered by the manuscripts.

Ribbeck (Rh. M. 118, p. 120) has:

iamque ipsi verita a! se orbam flet maesta parente  
cum Iove communes qui nolit habere nepotes.

In this reading *verita a!* is very feeble, and *no! it* implies that

Scylla had told her father of her wish to marry Minos. There seems to be no justification for this presumption, and it is most unlikely that Scylla should broach the subject before the restoration of peace between the two armies.

Baehrens (Jahrb. 105, pp. 847 ff.) follows Ribbeck closely, but he makes some changes:

iamque ipsi verita a ! torvum flet maesta parentem  
cum Iove communes qui mittat habere nepotes.

He compares Catullus 64, 379 f. *anxia nec mater discordis maesta puellae | secubitu caros mittet sperare nepotes*. This reading he changes in his edition (PLM. II) to:

iamque ipsi verita heu ! torvum flet maesta parentem,  
cum Iove communes qui mittat avere nepotes.

Both of these readings are open to the same objections as Ribbeck's conjecture; and *torvum*, besides, is rather arbitrary.

R. Ellis (AJP VIII, p. 10 f.) conjectures:

iamque ipsi veritast orbum flet maesta parentem  
cum Iove communes qui non dat habere nepotes.

This he translates: "She laments the childless estate of her father, Nisus, forbidding the possession of grandchildren common to himself and Jupiter." Both reading and rendering are unsatisfactory.

For 361 Unger (J. of P. 16, p. 317) suggests:

cum Iove communes cui non datum habere nepotes.

This statement, however, is not true: if Scylla mentioned the matter to her father at all, he had the chance of an alliance with Jupiter, at any rate, but refused it.

For these two lines I propose a reading which follows the manuscript tradition throughout, except in the meaningless part of 361:

nunc regis amicis  
(namque ipsi veritast) orbum flet maesta parentem,  
cum Iove communes qui debet habere nepotes.

"Now before the king's friends (for she feared to do it before the king himself) she sorrowfully bewails the fact that her father is without an heir, whereas he ought to have grandchildren in common with Jupiter himself." It should be remembered that Nisus had no children but Scylla, and therefore no male heir; this fact Scylla would naturally wish to call to his mind in order to prepare him for the union with Minos which she intended to



propose later. Such a subject as this she would not care to open in direct conversation with her father, nor would she be likely to indulge in such fulsome flattery as that contained in 361 before his very face. It is most natural, however, that she should plan to reach the king's ear through his intimate associates.

For the dative *amicis* with *flet* compare Prop. I 12, 15 *felix qui potuit praesenti flere puellae*: in the present passage, however, *flet* is used rather in the sense of 'complain,' and the dative is used as with *dicere*.

## V. 427.

When Scylla has been bound to the prow of Minos' ship, she breaks forth into piteous lamentations and cries out loudly upon the hard-hearted king. "This treatment would have been just," she wails (vv. 425 ff.), "at the hands of my own countrymen whose city I betrayed; but I would sooner believe that the stars of heaven could forsake their courses than that you could use me so. *Iam iam scelus omnia vincit*" (v. 427).

It is strange that these last words, *iam iam scelus omnia vincit*, should have raised any doubts as to their genuineness or their proper interpretation. Yet the early editors tried to emend them; and Sillig gives this strange paraphrase, "*iamiam scelus a te commissum omnia licet scelestissima egreditur*." This interpretation is also accepted by Forbiger, the latest commentator on the poem. To me it seems very certain that the poet puts into Scylla's mouth a bitter restatement of the well-known line (Virg. Ecl. X 69), *omnia vincit amor: et nos cedamus amori*. Scylla no longer believes in the unchanging laws of nature, because her confidence has been shattered by Minos' monstrous conduct; and among the laws in which Scylla has lost her faith is the hitherto undoubted *omnia vincit amor*: this must be rewritten to read *scelus omnia vincit*, 'tis the powers of evil that rule the world.' We know that the poet had Vergil's line running in his head at the time he wrote this part of the poem, because he himself imitates it very closely just below, v. 437, *omnia vicit amor: quid enim non vinceret ille?*

## V. 490.

hic velut in niveo, tenera est cum primitus, ovo	490
effigies animantis et internodia membris	
imperfecta novo fluitant concreta calore.	
sic liquido Scyllae circumfusum aequore corpus	
semiferi incertis etiam nunc partibus artus	
undique mutabant atque undique mutabantur.	495

490 *tenera est* Hauptius *tener est* R *teneres* H *tenerae* Ba *tenere* L<sup>ε</sup>.

In the reading of H the final *s* is erased by a later hand, according to Haupt (Opusc. III. p. 88) and Baehrens' apparatus.

The early vulgate read *tenerae*; Sillig restored *tener est* from R; Haupt (l. c.) changed the latter to *tenera est* (*animans*, referring to an animal as opposed to a human being, is ordinarily feminine).

These changes from the almost universal testimony of the MSS. (*tenerae* is really the reading of BHL<sup>ea</sup>) is based, apparently, only on the theory that *velut cum* cannot be used in the sense of *velut* alone. The emenders have sought to find some principal verb on which the *cum* clause might depend. But there is nothing inherently impossible in *velut cum* in the sense of *velut* alone, and the following passage, Ov. Met. X 230 ff., seems to make it certain:

proximus, audito sonitu per inane pharetrae,  
frena dabat Sipylus, veluti cum praescius imbris  
nube fugit visa, pendentiaque undique rector  
carbasa deducit, ne qua levis effluat aura.

So I should prefer to read,

hic velut in niveo tenerae cum primitus ovo . . .

The same principle is involved in v. 479:

fertur et incertis iactatur ad aëra ventis,  
cumba velut, magnas sequitur cum parvola classes,  
Afer et hiberno bacchatur in aequore turbo,  
donec etc . . .

The commas after *velut* and *classes* should be omitted, and *velut* should be joined closely with *cum*. With the customary punctuation *cumba* and *parvola* are separated in the most awkward manner.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

IVAN MORTIMER LINFORTH.